

Arthur M. Arlin

The

State;

Religion;

and

Schools.

P
322.1
G761

REFERENCE



The State; Religion; and Schools.

A Lecture delivered in Winnipeg,
On February 16th, 1892,
By Alexander Grant,
Pastor of Baptist Church, Winnipeg.

PUBLISHED BY THE LADIES' AID.

WINNIPEG:
THE STOVEL COMPANY, PRINTERS.
1892.

PROVINCIAL LIBRARY
VICTORIA, B. C.

P

322.1

G761

The State; Religion; and Schools.



Even an ordinary observer of current events as reported from the portion of the world called Christendom cannot help seeing that the trouble of adjusting the relation of the religious sphere in its beliefs and practices to civil institutions and measures is by no means confined to Manitoba.

CONDITION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

Italy, the birthplace of modern jurisprudence, presents to-day the pitiable spectacle of religion in the attitude of angry but impotent protest against the State—the church claiming temporal jurisdiction and the State insisting on the fullest exercise of all her own functions.

France, in days not so remote, reckoned as the first-born son of the Church, is at present congratulating itself on having attained the twenty-first year of a stable government—a feat not accomplished by her for a century. A very large measure of the danger the young republic has been exposed to has come from what is known in her National Assembly or Chamber of Deputies as the Clerical party, whose desire and aim have been to resort to any form of government under which its ideas of Church and State would have more chance of recognition than under the republic. At present the republic is in the ascendant, but the fires are by no means burnt out as, like a straw in the wind, the late prosecution of the Archbishop of Aix by the Minister of Religion shows.

The new German Empire, that great lately-arisen power, whose portentous shadow (some think) falls across the peace prospects of Europe, is not threatened by Socialistic doctrine more than by Ultramontanism, which marshals a strong following in the German parliament. Socialism, when left to itself, breeds internal strife, making it largely self-destructive. The Clericals, on the other hand, in the country and Reichstag, have had one mind and an able leader. Ever since Prussia struck the blow at Austria without saying to Rome "By your leave," an implacable grudge and hostility have been nourished in the Vatican against her. The downfall of Napoleon III, who was the right arm of Ultramontanism, at the hands of Germany, demoralized Rome for a time, but since then she has rallied and keeps up the warfare both outside and inside the German parliament. Germany, even with the man of iron and blood, Von Bismarck, leading her, has had all she could do for the last twenty years to keep Rome's claims to jurisdiction in civil matters from being conceded.

England is not exempted. Within the easy memory of many, dwells the great political struggle to free Ireland from a State Church.

Every husting burned with the fierce fire of religious prejudices. To-day not a little importance is added to the coming contest between her two great political parties, because Welsh and Scotch disestablishment are pretty sure to be sequences of victory for the Liberals. A very great deal of the hostility which rankles in the minds of the people against the House of Lords centres on the bench of bishops. The opposition given to the legislation passed lately by the Salisbury government providing increased aid to the board schools came entirely from the church party both outside and inside parliament. They seek to retain the advantages which they believe denominational schools give to their Church; while board school advocates, who are gradually but certainly winning the day, are pressing for education along national lines. By this it may become clear why the Conservative government in England was so sorely pressed in passing its School Bill. The quick-of-man's nature can never be reached more effectually in any country than when a proposal is made to abrogate any privilege possessed by a religious party. Then comes the clash of war; Greek meets Greek, as in our own little Manitoba to-day.

NEW WORLD REPUBLICS.

Coming westward across the ocean and looking towards Mexico and the South and Central American Republics, a state of chronic unrest is observed. Suffice it is to say concerning these countries that while other and divers causes of disturbance inhere in their physical and civil constitutions, we are not aside from the mark in alleging that the old trouble of religious privilege coming into conflict with modern ideas of liberty and equality is a precipitant of no mean proportion.

Brazil, the latest-born of Republics is insisting on the total separation of Church and State. This means no doubt that the country has to pass through years of dangerous intrigue aiming at reaction—years in which liberty will be carrying its life in its hand until Church and Religion have learned that they cannot impose their burdens on the civil back.

The United States constitution specifically declares that "congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"; and that no test of a religious kind, not even a religious oath upon assuming office, should that office be the Presidency, be in the way of any citizen, otherwise eligible, to occupy any post in the service of the body politic. Many, indeed most of the several States forming the Union follow suit, embodying in their several constitutions the principle that "no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity on account of his religious opinions." "All this," as Justice Story says in his commentary on the constitution "is to show that the design was to cut off forever every pretence of any alliance between Church and State;" yet in the face of all this it is notorious that Catholics have been "getting in their work" along their

historic and predestined lines. Their influence on the several State legislatures and Congress in passing laws favorable to their interests ; the enormous grants of public money secured by them for their charitable and educational institutions, the solid phalanx and indivisible front presented at election times when their votes are cast as the Vatican commands, all this is notorious. But the card they hold to win on, is their fierce antagonism to public schools whenever and wherever these schools are not held and used by trustees favorable to their faith. In some of the New England States the public schools are pretty well captured by them already. The fiat has gone forth where this is not possible, that for every Catholic church there be a parochial school ; that too, is about, if not fully a realized fact throughout the United States ; moreover they propose to keep up the agitation until the civil authorities give them a rate of the public taxation for these parochial schools. It may not be so long until party necessity, as politics over there are run—and the Catholics, you may well believe, have studied out the question thoroughly—may be prepared to pay the price asked for the solid vote which is held ready for an emergency. In the meantime sweet peace by no means hovers over the United States. Rum, Rome and Rebellion were said to be the three great sources of internal danger. Rebellion is ended. Rum is having lusty blows dealt it in many States by prohibitive legislation, but Rome, and by that I mean the Church and State idea, is working in secrecy and appointing an early day for the realization of its cherished hopes.

CANADA'S ANOMALIES.

Here in Canada we have a peculiar history. A strange and anomalous thing has happened. Protestant Great Britain, which proscribes Roman Catholicism at home, establishes it in Quebec. When the American States seceded, Britain was glad to retain Canada at the price of giving Roman Catholics all they asked. The privileges then obtained continue in Quebec. Church-and-State regime is supreme there as perhaps in no country, even in old Europe. We have a Canadian Confederation with such links in it as Church and State Quebec, semi-Church-and-State Ontario, free-State-with-free-Church New Brunswick, and who-knows-what-it-is Manitoba. Quebec, true to her principles, dictates from religious considerations to the Premier of the Dominion. Men are appointed or not appointed to the Cabinet or Bench according to their attitude to Roman Catholicism. In Ontario the situation is if anything worse. Her semi-Church-and-State position produces the "Equal Rights" platform, which, instead of calling out the Roman Catholics as such from politics, calls in the Protestant bodies as such, each clamoring for what is called "Equal Rights"—one body of Protestants demanding separate schools, another representation in the Cabinets, and again a larger grant of public money for Indian Industrial School work to even up with some other denominational body. Even in the North-West Territory, our nearest

neighbor, the cockatrice's egg is laid if not hatched. They have had nilly-willy foisted on them by a power outside of themselves, separate schools, and the question now is whether they can ever under our present constitution free themselves from them, even though the Territories were in no measure responsible for their creation.

WE MUST NOT DESPAIR.

All this I have given you to show that Manitoba is not suffering at the present moment but what is common to men. The turmoil and strife of ideas, and especially the fundamental principles which underlie the relation of Church and State, are certain to make themselves felt in a new country. We should accept our situation philosophically and calmly seek the best light we can obtain.

"I hold
That it becomes no man to nurse despair,
But in the teeth of clenched antagonisms
To follow up the worthiest."

Especially true is it, that it is not by coining ugly epithets for one another, we can either arrive at truth or convince the erring. We have the history and experience of past generations largely before us. We have living illustrations all around us. It ought not, if we lay aside prejudices, to be very hard to reach common ground on a few points at least where we can unitedly stand in social compact. We want to agree to live together, to pursue our different callings side by side, and to be mutually helpful to one another to the highest possible point attainable. We dare not think of dropping back into a state of savagery where the principle "Every man for himself" is avowed and lived up to, or even of patriarchy where sheiks or chiefs gather around them their own dependents each clan or tribe living a disconnected existence, except as cross interests bring them into strife.

CIVIL AUTHORITY OF DIVINE WARRANT.

An old book, whose sayings are worth a deal to some of us, affirms that civil rule is of God. "Powers that be, are ordained of God." It is extremely ridiculous for anyone to assume that this statement commits the book to any particular form of government; it merely declares a principle, viz:—that in man there is a propensity towards combined and regulated social action finding expression for itself in (say) king, parliament or police. This propensity has been called "The social appetite, or social instinct." Aristotle, because of it, defines man as a "political animal." Thus, from the Bible standpoint it can be said that "Powers *i. e.* constituted civil authorities, are of God" inasmuch as "every good gift and every perfect gift (in man's make-up) is from above, and cometh down from the Father of light." In marriage there is an analogous case. We say it is of God; we do not say by that whether it shall be arranged by parents or the individuals entering into the covenant. Should it happen

that any held by the former, *i. e.* arrangement by parents, he could not claim divine ordination of the relationship any more than one could holding the latter. And so the Book leaves us to discuss the principles of procedure upon which civil society shall be constituted?

ONE THEORY OF GOVERNMENT.

Is there any one on earth to whom we owe civil allegiance on account of a right which inheres in that one? Can any man or woman come to you or me and say, "I am so and so, my father was so and so, you must do what I say. You are mine, and your subjection to me is a duty which I have a born right to demand. My will is law." I may be very certain that everyone here would scorn such a claim, counting it the very height of absurdity. And yet be it remembered that until very lately this was generally accepted as the foundation and spinal column upon which society was constructed. It was and is called "The divine right of kings to rule," and on this theory of government, despotisms such as in Russia, and in a somewhat modified form in Germany are working to-day. Hereditary monarchies originated in this idea, although to-day they continue in some quarters not on that account, but as governmental conveniences.

Now, if we receive any one claiming a divine right over us in civil matters, why not in religious matters? And as a matter of fact, recognition of the former is always accompanied by a recognition of the latter. So a Pope is created to meet the necessity, claiming the right to do our thinking for us, and to command us in religious matters. When the Pope at Rome is disowned as he was by the Briton at the time of the English Reformation, a home-born Pope comes to the front in the person of Henry VIII, who with his successors, henceforth exercises lordship over both body and soul; and when the Pope of the English Reformation is disowned, some other poor sinful fellow-creature with a prefix on his name, such as Presbyter, Priest or Reverend, steps into his shoes, and men become his spiritual vassals. I think that honestly describes one conception of Government.

THE OPPOSITE THEORY.

Going now to the other extreme, the following theory of organized Society claims attention. All men are born free; every individual coming into this world has absolute right to the fullest use of himself, and must continue in this right and freedom, except as he voluntarily curtails it by lawful contract or forfeits it by crime. Put it this way, no man is, of necessity, a subject of Queen Victoria or the United States Republic or any other government. When we use the words, a born-subject, of this king or that government, we agree to use terms in a different sense to that which coined them. Every individual forming part of any civic body based on this idea is such by his own free consent, tacit or expressed. He and his equals agree to unite for certain common purposes, and in thus agreeing, each surrenders the exercise of certain

common rights inhering in the individual and vests them in the civic body thus created. It can be easily seen that in case such body disintegrates, as is quite possible, the rights held in trust and exercised by it revert to those from whom they were acquired. Our annual or quinquennial elections to public offices distinctly imply a periodic reversion of such rights to those with whom they originate. Now such a conception of civil government implies that the contracting parties may make the common basis of surrender of rights large or small, broad or narrow. For instance, they may make it as narrow as the construction of roads or as broad as the maintenance of Religion. By no means can it be denied that under the working of such a principle an agreement can be entered into, carrying out to the fullest extent the union of Church and State. The only way to determine that, is by finding whether in the judgment of the contracting parties such a surrender would work for their best interests.

Between these two principles many halting places have been sought for, and at least temporarily found, but after all anything else which might be mentioned would be but a qualified form of one or other of these principles.

DIVERSE PRODUCTS OF THESE THEORIES.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the former idea of government always and necessarily implies a pronounced and declared despotism and the latter a Republic or Commonwealth. Cromwell ruled as God's annointed and not as the choice of the people, and so in his day while there was a commonwealth in name it was largely a civil and religious despotism. The Republic in Rome was very far from an embodiment of our idea of freedom. The government of Massachusetts in the days of the Puritans was not by the people but by the Saints; the people were governed by the self appointed interpreters of the divine will with as firm and sometimes as cruel a hand as ever emperor or pope wielded. So we see that a Republic is not necessarily based on the will of the people, neither is a Monarchy based on the divine-right-of-kings idea. The point is, do the people fully consent, or is the thing thrust on them?

We must also be on our guard at this point lest we drop into the mistake of supposing that the line between those two conceptions of government ranges Roman Catholic on one side and Protestants on the other. Protestant Germany and Protestant England are operated more or less on the divine right idea. Roman Catholic Italy is making a bold strike for the popular will idea. Here in this country while we use terms and in some measure conform to customs implying the former, the genius and tendency and we might say the practice is wholly in line with the latter. If the constitution we are working under does not suit us we can amend it or abrogate it entirely. The people are sovereign and their will is supreme, and no practical man with an ounce of

common sense would think of an appeal to any higher authority. Her Majesty the Queen rules constitutionally and the people say what the constitution shall be. Now that being so you see that we as British subjects, having accomplished a bloodless revolution from a government on the divine right idea to a government resting on the popular will it is for us to say whether we agree to surrender a large or small share of the exercise of our individual rights to the body politic.

HOW FAR SHALL WE GO?

Shall we agree to have our business run, our homes run, our health run, our children run, our souls run for us, to have a common purse, a common debit and credit account and to proceed generally towards individual effacement and the total merging of all our personalities in the unit—the nation? Something like that Bellamy, the Boston dreamer, proposes. Socialism also has notions (speaking generally) of that character. Or shall we go in for the conservation and development of the individual and agree to surrender only where economy warrants, where the safety of the state necessitates, and where conscience is not invaded? At present free States proceed on the latter plan.

BOUNDARIES OF STATE FUNCTIONS.

By general consent it is agreed that common action cannot safely or successfully be taken in the maintenance of public worship or in the promulgation of religious beliefs. This at once makes the sphere of the State's action to be what is called secular. (The word has with some people an odious meaning and they choose to say that "secular" means "godless." This is neither just nor ingenious as the word is used in this connection simply to characterize a certain division of human activities in which a god-fearing and a godless man may operate with equal advantage.) By this arrangement any man or body of men is left free to believe, teach and practice in religious matters or not, as may seem good to each. The State takes no cognizance in that respect unless the public safety is endangered. The State gives liberty of worship to no one, much less does she tolerate any religion. The right of worship or non-worship, as conscience dictates, the State cannot give and cannot take away. That with every other human right inheres in the individual, and in a free state when the surrender of the exercise of certain rights and the investment of them in the body politic is being consummated the rights of religious beliefs and worship or no worship are reserved *in toto* by the individual. This arrangement makes such expressions as "Toleration of such-and-such a religious opinion or sect" and "Liberty of worship" the essence of absurdity.

As to what economy warrants in the transference of individual rights to the general use one can see at a glance that large room for difference of judgment as to limitation or expansion comes in. This generation may consider matters better managed by private enterprise—matters which

the preceding or succeeding generation thinks better managed by the nation. On this, while there is sufficient data to make the point both interesting and clear, I desire to say nothing, since among us the principle is not a burning question.

On the third condition of civil life in a free State, viz. : what the safety of the State necessitates, very much depends, and we must consider it more carefully. If we are to live in social compact together, and hand down from generation to generation national institutions which will prove increasing blessings, we are bound to regard what makes for or against their safety. A nation has its enemies and dangers and runs risks of its life as an individual does. A nation in the very act of becoming a nation and all along the course of its existence has a perfect right, nay it is its bounden duty to say to itself "If we are to continue (say) in the exercise of the fundamental principle of our polity—popular will as the sovereign power—if we are to be safe from the devices of the would-be despot, or from the capricious minds and catch verdicts of mobs, or the brute passions of the uneducated, or the swamping votes of late-comers who have not lived long enough among us to become impregnated with our genius, or from the intrigues of the ecclesiastic who would make the State an pendance to the Church, or a hundred other foes we must demand certain concessions of personal rights from those who propose to belong to the body politic." It may be found after a while's working that too much has been asked and conceded and that so much of a surrender is not required. If so, it is an easy thing to let the right revert to the individual. It may be found that more is necessary; then the public-minded citizen makes the surrender; he has the choice of protesting if he thinks the surrender is too great or uncalled for, and of endeavoring to bring the public to agree with him; if he does not care to or cannot do that and desires to hold by the right which he is called on to surrender he can do so by conveying himself to some quarter of the globe where he can enjoy it in his own person and not through the nation. Too great emphasis cannot be laid on this principle of free government. There is no way of determining at one point in history or in a nation's life what concessions should be demanded. It might be found necessary and highly wise for a free people to place the power of life or death for a limited time in the hands of one man. On the other hand it might be found necessary and highly wise for a free people to assume temporarily the functions of a judiciary setting aside for a time the lawfully appointed public functionaries. These are both extreme cases but they are given simply to illustrate the principle.

SHALL THE STATE EDUCATE?

Naturally this leads us to the question, should the State engage in the work of the education of the young? From what has been said it is clearly seen that if the State has a right to educate it is an acquired and delegated right; and also a right based either on economy or safety of the

State or both, and that its exercise must not encroach on the realm of conscience.

WHERE RESPONSIBILITY PRIMARILY BELONGS.

Since the right inheres in the individual, and since individuals are gathered by nature into families, the right in this case is divided among those responsible for the being and support of the child; and so we say the right of education properly, primarily and permanently belongs to the family. Lose sight of this or grasp it with a slack hand, hold it doubtfully or believe it indifferently and the whole question of education is a soulless thing made up of empty forms and tiresome conventionalities. Keep this clear in your mind, fasten it to your soul with hooks of steel, and whether your child goes under a public or private pedagogue for six hours of the day or not, the education of your child becomes a matter of tremendous importance. Begin with this idea and you cannot consider the knowledge imparted and the instruction given in writing, reading arithmetic, etc., as education. It goes in to help make the result. Keep this in your mind and you do not leave the public official to struggle away more than half his time with your child undoing what has been done at home. He is simply a co-operator, and if he thinks rightly of himself he knows that under proper conditions, yes, in any case, he is but a small factor working towards the sum total of a child's education. The child's education begins very early, certainly much earlier than when the school master gets a hold of him. It is going on all the eighteen hours when he is out of the hands of the school teacher. The food he eats and how he eats it; the bed he sleeps on, and how he sleeps on it; the clothes he wears and how he wears them; the words he hears and the faces he sees; the work he does and the work he does not; the example he gets and the companions he keeps; the books he reads, the pictures he sees, everything, sleeping and waking, sitting down and rising up, go towards education, everything is hitting the child into shape or out of shape. Indeed one may say truthfully that the greatest and most important part of the education is got anywhere and everywhere rather than with the school teacher. This much has to be said, whether it is decided to have the State take a hand in the work or not. What the State or any other corporation may do or not do, must not be allowed to affect our thoughts as to the relation of the child's education to home life. Consciously or unconsciously, with intent or without intent, education in the true sense of the term, and with all the solemn weight of meaning for a young plastic and immortal spirit is proceeding with every breath drawn.

THE CHURCH'S CLAIM TO EDUCATE.

Now approach claimants to a right in at least sharing the work of impressing, drawing out, training and imparting knowledge to the youth. First we observe a party which calls itself the Church. By this by no means is meant the Roman Catholic Church. It may be it; it most

frequently lets its voice urging its claim reach the public ear. But the Episcopalians, Lutherans and Presbyterians in the respective countries where their forms of religion are established and maintained by the State, are heard and heeded in their claims, operating when they can through the State schools. Other bodies of Christians establish voluntary schools not merely for higher but even primary education. It is understood by voluntary schools that the expenses are met without aid from and consequently without connection with the State. There are also schools under the patronage of public denominations receiving certain aid from the State and partly subject to the State.

Now, on what grounds does the Church claim the right to share in this work? Let us hear its plea. First and foremost it is held that the Church is the custodian and channel of certain most vitally important principles and influences, without which no child's education is complete. Second, that these principles should be imparted to, and these influences thrown around the child at the same time and in the same place and by the same agents as the principles of secular knowledge are imparted; that is, that you cannot commit education in the secular branch into one set of hands, and education in the religious branch into another set; that the child is a unit and therefore cannot be bisected into hemispheres, one to be cultivated secularly and the other religiously; and thirdly that the church should have in her own hands the management or largely so of the work; so that the selection of teachers, the proportion of this to that ingredient as compounded for the days lessons, the standard to be attained both by the teachers and scholars be matters very much if not wholly for the judgment of the Church. There is also a reason generally urged by the enemies of the Church, why she is so urgent in obtaining her share in the education of the child, viz: that she recognizes the necessity of imparting her doctrines to the immature mind and obtaining an ascendant influence before reason and mental strength are developed. This last may be so worded and shaped as to be quite defensible ground, and when so expressed is often taken as an additional argument for the Church's claims.

THE STATE'S CLAIM.

The second claimant for a share in the education of the young is the State. The strength of her case lies in the belief that free institutions are not safe in the hands of an uneducated populace; that in order that she may be fully guarded at this point, it is necessary that she to a certain extent at least, become responsible for the education of her future citizens; in other words education in certain matters and up to a certain standard she considers one of the conditions without which she cannot perpetuate herself in freedom. It is also urged that a homogeneous people is a great desideratum for the integrity and peace of a nation. If sectionalisms and diversities of inclination are to be minimized and the people calling themselves a nation or State to be unified within the limits of their compact, it is held that the common atmosphere and pursuits

of the public school are a prime necessity thereto. How much weight this should have cannot be fully adjudged without remembering the marvellously diverse elements both ethnically and religiously which we are trying to build up into a national unit on this continent. An additional reason on economical grounds is given. If the State agrees that the education of the youth is a necessity, it means that a very considerable portion, at least the majority, perhaps the whole of the number composing the State are individually and severally convinced of it; and remembering that the individual as representing the family is primarily responsible for the work, no doubt they mean to proceed to carry out their purpose; but at this point the most economical means to the end becomes a matter of consideration. Shall a certain member of the family, the mother or father, or shall someone outside the family have this work allotted to him or her; or shall a number of families having affinities, club together and provide a common teacher for their several youths? Any one of these plans may be pursued and all have been worked and worked very successfully so far as the education of the young to the extent aimed at by such means is concerned.

WHICH SHALL BE ALLOWED.

Now, observing these claimants to a share in the work, the Church urging its claim with reasons, the State urging its claim with reasons, we are under necessity of adjudicating between them. Doubtless, whichever makes good its claim, we must find the most economical way of going about the work. Which shall be allowed? Shall either? or neither? or both? or can some compromise be effected by which all interest may be conserved? Now remember the family is the deciding power—the family as expressing itself when it comes to a poll of the enfranchised member or members of it. Shall we allow the Church's claim?

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ATTITUDE.

At this point we are struck by the extraordinary attitude taken by some speaking in behalf of the Church, which leads us to ask the question: Does she expect to settle the case by peremptorily asserting a divine right and infallible mandate? It is getting late in the world's history—freedom's work has been too well done to expect her to succeed in making her claim good along that line. Even in hyper-Catholic countries a very strong, and in some a preponderating element resists every claim in any matter civil or religious founded on pretensions of infallibility. Nevertheless it is well to remember that whatever the Roman Catholic Church says or claims whether in Italy, New York or Manitoba it backs up by the dogma of infallibility. To refuse her dictum proceeding from such a source is to expose ourselves to certain damnation. She may and does hold this ground of her claim in a certain measure of mental reservation where it is likely to be pooh-poohed; but let it not be forgotten by us in Manitoba. The Catholic Church may make a great fuss over the meaning of a certain

clause in a statute as if it were simply for civil rights guaranteed by compact she were battling ; but be the force of such a clause this or that she cannot and does not claim and dare not accept more or less than the infallible head says she must have, be it allowed by statute or not. This much for the Catholic Church.

RESULTS BY THE VOICE OF HISTORY.

But she is not all we include in the word "Church" as we use it, and so we have to deal in a general way with the Church's claim. What says the voice of history in answer? We mean to ask some plain questions and we think history can give us unequivocal answers. Has the Church ever had her claims to the right of educating the youth allowed in any portions of the world, so as to demonstrate by results her right to have them conceded by us to-day? and if she has, have her claims been allowed long enough to give her ample time to perfect her machinery, mature her measures and produce honest fruit? Has she been in such a position by environments as to be free from hampering circumstances tending to nullify her efforts in this work? If so we want to know what have been the results—on education, on the family, on the nation, and on the Church herself? I hold that history has an ample answer to give us and as wise men we want to heed the voice of history.

FREEDOM DIES.

For centuries the Church's claims have been admitted in every European country. In many of them, indeed most of them, they are at present in whole or in part admitted. In these countries and during the centuries the Church's influence has been predominant, her means have been more than ample and her actual power such as to command circumstances to whatever end she desired. The result in education has been—what? *Such that no country desiring to continue in the enjoyment of free institutions could think of trusting for one moment without let or hindrance the sovereign franchise to the common people.* Wherever the Church controls education there civil as well as religious liberty dies ; wherever civil and religious liberty thrives educational means cease from the hands of the ecclesiastic ; wherever the church persists in her claims there more or less the mass of the people are the unenlightened dumb, driven herd, the easy prey of the fanatic or the demagogue. This is incontrovertible. The European nations are one stupendous example of it. In Germany and in Scotland the ecclesiastic in a larger measure than in most other countries has been ruled out of the school, consequently you have their people year by year rising to a higher place in the family of nations. It was said when France was humbled and Paris bombarded that it was not so much due to German bullets or bayonets as to the German schoolmaster. When France had made her peace with Germany her solemn vow was that her youth should be educated by the State. ~~For twenty years she has been struggling against Rome to keep that vow.~~

THE FAMILY IS SECULARIZED.

In the family what is the result ? We hear a great deal to-day about secular schools—godless schools—as they are called. Well, suppose we say “godless schools” to ourselves so often that at last we begin to think that we have indeed nurseries of infidelity and crime in our midst, have we not merely succeeded in pulling the wool over our eyes. The individual and the family furnish the elements out of which the nation’s constitution in its strength or weakness is built up. What then about “godless homes” ? Let us sincerely question whether the assumption by the Church of education as she says for the sake of religious principles and influence does or does not secularize the home. That would be a serious business indeed ; much more serious than secularizing our schools. At most, the schoolmaster, whether he be the choice of the family, Church or State can have the child but a few hours out of the twenty-four. Can religion be done up like grammar or the multiplication table ? Are we working on the right idea when we aim at catching the waters some distance from the fountain-head ? Should the religious filter be going but six hours out of the day ? I think the voice of history, when faithfully written, and read without prejudice, declares against ecclesiastical schools because they secularize the home. I go further ; it is even a serious question if our much lauded Sabbath Schools are not working in the same harmful way. We can, I believe, afford to do without even the Sabbath School rather than have religion relegated from our homes to some outside quarters. But some one answers that there are so many homes absolute blanks as to the possibility of their being religious ; how about the children of such ? I answer, why are these homes in such a condition ? Has the Church lost faith in her evangel that she must needs fly to education as her hope ? Is she spending the time she ought to give such homes in what the world now knows to be abortive efforts at education ? Or is she taking the surest way to secure for the next generation religious homes by aiming to influence the youth religiously, apart and away from home ? Let the Church’s aim be to permeate the family which is the fountain of life physical, moral, social, national and religious with those precious and incorruptible principles which are best taught by godly example in holy lives rather than by rote and rod, and we will hear less about secular and godless schools.

CAN THE STATE TEACH RELIGION.

Let the State’s claim be considered. We have given the ground of such claim. At the very start we are confronted with the objection that the State, being secular, cannot undertake a complete education inasmuch as in such, religion must be an element. In answer, some affirm that the State is not secular and that it is only non-denominational, and that the State can give an all round education, teaching for religion those revealed truths common to all the sects. What is right at this point ? Is it indispensable that the State, if its claims be allowed, teach religion in some form and

measure in order to be intrusted with the work? If you hold it to be indispensable, we have a right to ask which religion shall it be? It is exceedingly easy for you to say off-hand that there is no religion but Christianity. But that being admitted, who shall settle what Christianity is? Christianity cannot be taught in its barest and most rudimentary parts without settling who and what its founder is. Is he divine or human? At one time New England was largely imbued with Unitarianism, then their schools would teach Christianity with a human founder. With the majority of us, Christianity means a divine founder, but there are exceptions. Are these exceptions not to be considered; are their convictions and consciences not to be taken into account? "Oh! yes," you say, "we would allow the children of such or any others who may conscientiously differ, to withdraw before religious education or worship comes on." I have wondered beyond measure that the incongruity and absurdity of the position we are now facing and which stands at present embodied in our disputed School Act does not strike its promoters. That person must be tough in the sensibilities who does not see in such an arrangement—if it can be called an arrangement—a mean, contemptible and cowardly process of daily martyrdom for these little children. Why should my child, because of a belief held in common with me, be daily exposed to the gibes and stares and cheap remarks of its thoughtless companions as it rises to leave the room when the hour of so called religion comes. The cruelty of the situation is intolerable in thought. The fear is, that when the pinch came, the child would beg off from the ordeal and the parent consent. To that extent inestimable wrong is done the consciences of those who have entered into civil compact on the understanding that conscience would be inviolate.

THE STATE SCHOOL AND CIVIL LIBERTY.

Now let us come closer to the question of State's right to insist on having a hand in the education of her future citizens. It is quite true that the claim is rather modern; on that ground certainly we cannot reject it. Extended suffrage is more modern still; we do not think of rejecting it. The separation of Church and State in the broad sense of the term is quite modern; no one of this company is disposed to reject it. Although modern it may be right. In fact may it not remain for us of these last days to discover and apply the means by which civil institutions may be perpetuated in freedom, by which a new page in history may be written clear of the blots which besmear former pages? It is quite true that looking back a couple of hundred years one can see the faint beginning of the idea; the last hundred, yes fifty years, have seen its operations on anything of a scale sufficient to warrant us looking on it now as beyond the experimental stage. Be it remembered now that these periods distinctly mark the beginnings and growth of civil and religious liberty. Is that I ask a mere coincidence, or is there a vital connection and necessary relation between them? Does any man think that the school as establish-

ed by the State is a mere fly on the wheel of our freedom and progress; that we could have made the strides in civilization in its richest fruits which this century and country have seen, had the State schoolmaster not been aboard? If he does, he is free to point out among the nations of the earth some instance where his opinion is vindicated. I have believed and do believe that before the fight about schools is over that the comparatively small question of Separate schools and Protestant schools, or schools without the Bible or with the Bible will be shelved, and that the State school, the free public school will have to fight, fight for its life, its very life, not for this or that in it or about it, but its life. I fearlessly say that the Roman Catholic policy is one of undying and uncompromising antagonism to the public school as such. They may and do veil their purposes under guise of a claim for Separate schools, or back of that, under guise of an objection to Secular schools, but the fact is they are no better pleased with schools where the Bible is read than where they are purely Secular. What they object to is the free-State school. They as reactionaries against modern ideas of freedom and progress are right in that antagonism. They have properly divined the motive power of freedom, and would dry up the stream by stopping up the fountain. They have chosen their ground of attack with great strategic wisdom. A knowledge of Catholic doctrines, proclivities, policy and sentiments make it certain that friendship to the public school is impossible for them. Cannot we take the cue from that one sentence not out of any hostility to Catholics nor their Church as such, but out of the sense of self defence of our public life and conclude that what they hate is the best thing for us, and what they love and would foist upon us works for our enslavement! There cannot I think be a doubt but that the State's claims to share in the work of educating our youth, must for the present be allowed. Let us keep in mind, however, that no right inheres (in the proper sense of the term) in the State, and that as we yield so we may re-assume. Some better way may yet be found, but while we are finding it this approves itself by results most gratifying to those privileged to live in the nineteenth century, and on the North American continent.

RELIGION IN THE SCHOOL.

Now what about religion in the schools? We answer, it should be excluded so far as exercises, forms or lessons. The more we can have of religion, that is, the highest and purest principles of thought and action, sentiments of unselfishness, tenderness and love, incarnated in the men and women whom we select to be entrusted with our precious treasures at such an important period in life, and for such noble purposes the better. Every public function needs to be in the hands of men embodying what most of us would regard as the best products of religion. We have no right to ask how he came to be what he is, but we have every right to inquire and satisfy ourselves that he is what we want, and recognize to be necessary to fulfill faithfully the duties of the public office

entrusted to him. That is true generally, and cannot be too rigorously acted upon. But especially true and especially binding upon the community is this principle of selection when it comes to us to decide who shall be allowed to take a hand in cultivating the minds of the next generation. If I am sending my boy to learn blacksmithing, I do not inquire whether his master and teacher opens or closes his shop with a form of prayer, and makes his apprentices recite religious formulas, but I am most particular that he be an honest, industrious, clean-minded, clean-mouthed, capable mechanic. When it comes to choosing between the best mechanic without character and an inferior mechanic with character, the former is, "not in it." Understood in that way, we want all the religion we can get into our schools, but so far as forms, exercises and lessons, they must be excluded; and why? Because the State is secular, and consequently cannot constitute itself a judge, director or teacher of religion. The State cannot say if there is a Bible, or even a God. This, I have no doubt, will give some good people the horrors, but I think it is next to useless to reason with such. They proceed from premises entirely different from ours; they do not regard the civil constitution as a compact of free men, but as existing *in jure divino*, and vested otherwise than by the popular will. Such would speak of "a Christian nation," and "the most Christian nation," which is, after all, but a corollary of Church and State as believed in by Rome. But let us for a moment consider our position. The State cannot say if there is a Bible or even a God. Why cannot it say it? Because the units comprised in the State do not believe in the Bible or in a God? Certainly not. They may or may not. Because they are not all agreed that there is a Bible or a God? Certainly not. They may be agreed to a man that there is or is not a Bible or a God. Why cannot they say it then? Simply because by the compact which contains the surrender of certain specified individual rights, in whole or in part, the right of deciding or pronouncing upon matters of religious belief is withheld. So we say to the State, "Stick to your last, shoemaker," we never gave you any say about a Bible or a God." Is that safe? Should we not, in order to make religion a felt and realized quantity in the life of a nation, have our legislature pass a law saying "There is a God," saying that Jupiter and Thor, etc., are not gods, but that "Jehovah is God"? Another statute could fix which Bible we must have and use, and whether the Apocrypha is canonical Scripture or not, etc., etc. Why not? Because slowly and surely the world finds out that the Man of Nazareth, Jesus the Prophet of Galilee knew more about how to conduct human affairs than all the Popes and Ecumenical Councils ever convened, and that the true solution which makes for peace and prosperity lies in an absolute separation governmentally between matters belonging to Cæsar and those belonging to God. Is religion going to suffer by this? Religion has always suffered by the union of the civil and religious spheres. Religion has next to died out in Italy, Spain, France, Mexico and every

other country where the union has been worked. In Scotland, when Church and State covered the country, Moderatism, which means World-lyism, ate the heart out of religion. The Free-Church movement saved religion in Scotland. Can Quebec, where Church and State are practically united, show a higher standard of morality (which should be the result of religion when doing its best) than the other Provinces, where there is a separation of Church and State? No greater harm can be done religion than by putting it in the shape of civil enactment. We believe that religion in any form or measure, or at any time provided by the State in connection with any of her institutions is a grand mistake. When the State undertakes to teach religion in a school, penitentiary or asylum, or to a tribe of Indians, it is standing in the way of the progress of religion. Let the State mind its business, which is made up of matters purely secular—then religion, as propagated, not by hirelings but by free men in the exercise of their freedom, will make its due progress and impression.

THE STATE AND MORALS.

Some one proposes to down us with the inquiry as to what is to become of public morals. If we agree that a State can have no religion is it therefore settled that she can have no morals? By no means. Morals can and ought to be enforced. Take this in its simplest form. Your neighbor has a propensity towards the reduction of your woodpile. You have an inherent right to make him (if you can) stay on his own side of the fence, and leave to you what belongs to you. Let it be agreed in a community that the care of the several woodpiles and property in general shall be a public function; then the State enacts a law against theft which is as you know the eighth commandment in the Mosaic decalogue. We do not pass laws against theft however because the eighth commandment is found in the Book of Exodus. Were that the reason we would be launched on a sea of legislation something akin to the Blue Laws of Connecticut. The fact is, that an agreement against theft is arrived at by the public sense; then we come to talk of putting that sense in the shape of a statute with pains and penalties attached; but at that point no one has a right to ask his neighbor how he came to have that sense. He may have it by studying the ethics of Confucius or Zoroaster or in the case of the Jew from Moses or as in the case of a Christian from Jesus Christ, or he may not be able to trace it to any such source only knowing it as a law of his nature or the deduction of experience based on utility. It is not the business of any citizen how his neighbor got his sense of morals. If in every case it comes from the spiritual experience which the Christian calls regeneration, I believe all the better for the law which is enacted against theft, that is, all the better for its chances of being observed; if it comes from a utilitarian source all the worse for the law—it is likely in that case to be honored more in the breach than the observance, as by that, honesty is reduced merely to policy. But whatever be the creative means of a public sense which records itself against theft, on all accounts we,

as a community, agree that we need and must have the law. So on through all legislation involving moral issues. Civil laws cannot make it moral or immoral to steal. The moral sentiment must exist in the people prior to the enactment of the law and as that sentiment improves or degenerates, so will the character of the legislation and compliance with the legislation. Right here the work of religion and Christainity comes in. If it believes in itself it will seek to affect the individual so that in the aggregate the influence of the unit may make itself felt along the whole line. That is the true connection of Church and State. Instead of labouring to have our legislatures open with prayer, etc., then leaving them to their nefarious juggling with public trusts without heart or conscience, let the Church labor to regenerate the members one by one, or if not regenerate, at least so influence them as to cause them to be amenable to God's laws, so that wherever these men are they can be trusted to act like men of integrity and purity. The State has no right to enter the domain of religion in any respect. The State has no right to act towards religion as its patron, protector or propogator. The State cannot tolerate any religion. If it has a right to tolerate, it has a right to persecute. Religion occupies a sphere entirely distinct from and independent of that of the State. As to property or vested rights secured in a lawful way and held by any religious corporation of people within a State, the same regulations should apply as to a Loan Co. or Fire Insurance Co. Exemption from taxation is partial State support. We are committed to the vicious principle as much in not collecting an amount of money rightfully due the State, as when the State makes a grant. Every dollar of exemption is a dollar of aid from the State. The sooner the last vestige of Church and State connection is eradicated from our civil polity, whether Imperial, Dominion, Provincial or Municipal, the better for the peace and prosperity both of the State and Religion. Religion is the greatest help to the State and the State to Religion where each is operating in its own independent sphere. The State most impedes Religion and Religion most impedes the State, when a junction is made so that they are working under any legalized connection. We believe all history proves this to be true.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC'S CONSCIENCE.

Finally, we hear the claim made that there is an intolerable interference with the consciences of a portion of our fellow-citizens by requiring the attendance of children at schools where religion in church authorised forms is not a considerable portion of the subject-matter of education, that is, in cases where the parents believe and hold as a part of their creed that education of this kind is not fit for their children. This is a serious looking plea and one not lightly to be passed over. We are not now discussing whether they are right or wrong in their belief. We hold also that the State is not competent to judge as to the rightness or wrongness of their belief. The point then turns on whether or not a man or a body of men

may be allowed to do or not to do, if only the claim is made that the action, or non-action, is a matter of conscience and religion. If the State has no power to advance against a citizen, either to compel or prevent his action so soon as he shelters himself behind conscience, evidently the civil fabric must be thrown into ruin at once. Anarchy and Thuggism have simply to declare themselves religions and their disciples devotees of consciencious beliefs, for us to have the bombshell and dagger doing their deadly work without let or hindrance. Do not tell us that we are supposing an unsupposable case. Remember that polygamy has already tried the trick, going as far as even to invent a bible of its own to support its claims. Lust, foul as ever defaced the likeness of God in the human soul, exalted itself in the neighboring Republic into a religion, and this religion claiming to itself the only means of saving women's souls, laid polygamy as a sacred duty on the consciences of the male portion of the inhabitants in the Territory of Utah. Do you think that the United States said to itself "We cannot interfere; it is a matter of conscience; it is their religion." By no means; down came Congress thundering with its anti-Mormon laws and these voluptuaries learned that the State had some say as to the boundaries of conscience if she has none as to what is within these boundaries after they are defined. That is just how the matter resolves itself. The State of necessity must consider her own safety and the respective rights of her citizens. If any citizen, or body of citizens, does or leaves undone what endangers the life and liberty of the body politic, or interferes with the rights of others, the State must interfere and no plea of conscience should prevent her. Let her be sure, then, that the public school, without religion prescribed or taught, is a necessity, and that she owes it to herself and citizens respectively; then if any cry out "conscience", let them cry out, and let the State do her duty. Should it be shown us, as I believe it can easily be done, that a conscience manufactured by the behests of the Vatican, the enemy of liberty, and operated by a domineering priesthood, which cannot reconcile itself to a government created and regulated by popular will, is what wants consideration in the matter of public schools, to do our duty will cost us less feeling than it would if the dictates of an Agnostic or Socialistic conscience were clamoring for consideration. But any way, whoever he be, or whatever that body be, be it religious or irreligious, that puts forward any doctrine antagonistic to the genius of free institutions, we in this young country should not for a moment be disposed to potter or parley in the business. The world has had all its wants of tyranny and class privilege, and the very last reason why anyone should be qualified or disqualified in the eyes of the civil law should be his religious belief or unbelief so long as the rights of others are concerned. What is the use of citing eastern countries to us in the New West as examples of what we should have and do, when it is a notorious fact that as we recede eastward we find class privileges both in civil and religious spheres casting their pernicious upas-like shadow

over the mass of the populace. Many are ready to point out the dangers of liberty such as we plead for, and decry its results, but they will find they can no more bring back medieval conditions of social or religious life, which is their ideal, than an owl can bring back the night that has gone, by screeching at noon-day.

THE TRUE POSITION.

We do not want to arouse prejudices; we want to allay them. We believe that only by keeping the sphere of civil life distinct and separate from that of religious life can the people of Manitoba grow up in harmony and neighborly respect and love. I respect a Catholic's conscience as much—not more—than I do a Baptist's. I believe that when we come to play each our part in the rôle as citizen that the maxim of the Catholic Bishop of Detroit is supreme wisdom and should be followed. Said he, "It is not the very Reverend John Foley, Bishop of Detroit, or even John Foley, Catholic, but simply John Foley, citizen." Does the man become less a Christian or a Catholic by this? Do I become less a Baptist by taking the same ground? I trow not. This principle cannot help becoming more and more a realized fact:—Each institution, the Church and the State, complete in itself and independent of the other, yet each by the separate completeness and independence most helpful to the other in reaching results which are for each to live and labor for.

"And so these twain upon the skirts of time
Sit side by side full summ'd in all their powers
Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be
~~Self-reverent each and reverencing each~~
Distinct in individualities.

Then comes the statelier Eden back to men
Then reign the world's great bridals chaste and calm
Then springs the crowning race of human kind
May these things be."



h

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED FROM THE RECORDS OF THE BUREAU OF THE LAND OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON JANUARY 1, 1900.

10-1

300

